



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/691,872

10/23/2003

Sterling Reasor

MSFT121743

6758

26389

7590

07/16/2008

CHRISTENSEN, O'CONNOR, JOHNSON, KINDNESS, PLLC

1420 FIFTH AVENUE

SUITE 2800

SEATTLE, WA 98101-2347

EXAMINER

JOO, JOSHUA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2154

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/16/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/691,872	<b>Applicant(s)</b> REASOR ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> JOSHUA JOO	<b>Art Unit</b> 2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 April 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,12,15,24,27 and 37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,12,15,24,27 and 37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 October 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

***Detailed Action***

1. This Office action is in response to communication dated 04/24/2008.  
Claims 1, 12, 15, 24, 27, and 37 are presented examination.

**Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114**

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 04/24/2008 has been entered.

**Response to Arguments**

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 12, 15, 24, 27, and 37 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. New ground(s) of rejection are necessitated by Applicant's amendment.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112**

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:  
  
The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
5. Claims 1, 12, 15, 24, 27, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
  - i) Regarding claims 1 and 27, "the authorization" has insufficient antecedent basis.

Art Unit: 2154

- ii) Regarding claim 15, "the authorization" and "the set of criteria" has insufficient antecedent basis. Furthermore, "the identification of data" has insufficient antecedent basis as the claim recites of, "an identification of content".

### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1, 15, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goel et al. US Patent #7,130,841 (Goel hereinafter), in view of Kirsch, US Patent #7,031,954 (Kirsch hereinafter), Land et al. US Publication #2006/0080306 (Land hereinafter) and Walters et al. US Patent #7,216,115 (Walters hereinafter).

8. As per claim 1, Goel teaches substantially the invention as claimed including a computer network having two or more computing devices in communication, a method for managing data available for access on the network, the method comprising:

obtaining, at a host computing device included as part of the computing network and associated with a user, a first user request to identify data corresponding to a set of criteria (col. 5, line 61-64; col. 6, line 5-19. Query at local system. Search terms.);

obtaining an identification of data stored on the host computing device associated with the first user request and matching the set of criteria (col. 6, lines 6-9, 46-49. Receive first result. col. 7, lines 47-56. Result may include identifier.);

automatically obtaining an identification of data stored on at least one computing device included in the computer network and matching the set of criteria (col. 6, lines 9-14, 50-64. Automatically query remote system to derive a second result.);

merging the identification of data stored on the host computing device associated with the user request and the identification of data stored on the at least one computing device included in the computer network (col. 7, lines 47-56. Combine the first and second result.);

generating a result of the merging the identification of data stored on the host computing device associated with the first user request and the identification of data stored on the at least one computing device included in the computer network (col. 8, line 5-15. Display the result after combining.);

maintaining a record of the result of the merging the identification of data stored on the host computing device associated with the first user request and the identification of data stored on at least one computing device included in the computer network (col. 8, line 5-15. Display the result. It is inherent that the result is stored in memory while being displayed.);

obtaining, at the host computing device, a second user request to identify data corresponding to the set of criteria (col. 5, line 61-64; col. 6, line 5-19. Query at local system. Search terms. It is inherent that a user may make more than one query with the same terms.);

obtaining an identification of content stored on the host computing device associated with the second user request and matching set of criteria (col. 6, lines 6-9, 46-49. Receive first result. col. 7, lines 47-56. Result may include identifier.).

9. Goel does not specifically teach:

the set of criteria including a unique security ID associated with the user;

verifying the authorization of the user to access the data corresponding to the set of criteria based on the unique security ID;

determining that at least one other computing device is not available to receive a content query;

recalling the record of the result of the merging the identification of data stored on the host computing device associated with the first user request and the identification of data stored on the at least one computing device of the two or more computing devices included in the computer network;

merging the identification of data stored on the host computing device associated with the second user request and the record of the result of the merging the identification of data stored on the host computing device associated with the first user request and the identification of data stored on the at least one computing device of the two or more computing devices included in the computer network; and

generating a result of the merging the identification of data stored on the host computing device associated with the second user request and the record of the result of the merging the identification of data stored on the host computing device associated with the user request and the identification of data stored on the at least one computing device of the two or more computing devices included in the computer network.

10. Kirsch teaches of a method for searching content comprising of a set of criteria including a unique security ID associated with the user; and verifying the authorization of the user to access the data corresponding to the set of criteria based on the unique security ID (claim 1; col. 2, lines 2-14; col. 4, lines 3-19).

11. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the set of criteria to include a unique security ID associated with the user; and verify the authorization of the user to access the data corresponding to the set of criteria based on the unique security ID. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Kirsch's teachings would improve Goel's teachings by providing security of content on the network in order to prevent unauthorized accessed to private information.

12. Land teaches of a system for querying a search engine for a database, wherein a client device determines that an other computing device (remote server) is unavailable to receive a query and performs at the host computer (claim 21).

Art Unit: 2154

13. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings to determine if the other computing device is not available to receive a query and perform a local search at the host computer. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Land's teachings would improve the suggested system by allowing offline searching of content to respond to a query and prevent the unnecessary querying and waiting of an unavailable device.

14. Goel, Kirsch, and Land still do not specifically teach of:

recalling the record of the result of the merging the identification of data stored on the host computing device associated with the first user request and the identification of data stored on the at least one computing device of the two or more computing devices included in the computer network;

merging the identification of data stored on the host computing device associated with the second user request and the record of the result of the merging the identification of data stored on the host computing device associated with the first user request and the identification of data stored on the at least one computing device of the two or more computing devices included in the computer network; and

generating a result of the merging the identification of data stored on the host computing device associated with the second user request and the record of the result of the merging the identification of data stored on the host computing device associated with the user request and the identification of data stored on the at least one computing device of the two or more computing devices included in the computer network.

15. Walters teaches of a search system, wherein the results of prior searches with same terms or keywords are combined with subsequent search records (col. 4, lines 24-31; col. 11, lines 18-26).

16. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the suggested system with the teachings of Walters to merge a subsequent search record with a search record from a previous search with the same terms or keywords. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Walter's teachings would enhance the suggested system by allowing a user

to identify and review results of prior and current searches, and provide a sorted list to allow identification of previously reviewed responses.

17. As per claim 15, Goel teaches substantially the invention as claimed including a method for managing data available for access on the network:

obtaining a user request to identify content stored on the two or more computing devices, wherein one of the two or more computing devices is a local computing device (col. 5, line 61-64; col. 6, line 5-

19. Query at local system. Search terms.);

automatically querying the two or more computing devices within the computer network to identify the contents of local computing storage locations (col. 6, lines 4-14, 50-64. Automatically query local and remote system to derive a first and second result.);

merging the results of the querying (col. 7, lines 47-56. Combine the first and second result.);  
and

displaying the results of the merge query results (Paragraph 0025. Displays results to user.);  
maintaining a record of the result of the merging the results of the querying (col. 8, line 5-15. Display the result. It is inherent that the result is stored in memory while being displayed.);

obtaining a second user request to identify content stored on the two or more computing devices (col. 5, line 61-64; col. 6, line 5-19. Query at local system. Search terms. It is inherent that a user may make more than one query.);

obtaining an identification of content stored on a computing device associated with the unique user identifier and matching the unique user identifier (col. 6, lines 6-9, 46-49. Receive result. col. 7, lines 47-56. Result may include identifier.).

18. Goel teaches of obtaining an identification associated with the identifier and matching the identifier but does not specifically teach:



the identifier is a unique user security identifier:

verifying the authorization of the user to access the data corresponding to the set of criteria based on the unique security ID;

determining that the at least one computing device is not available to receive a content query;

recalling the record of the merging of the results of the queries;

merging the identification of data stored on the computing device associated with the unique user identifier and the record of the result of the merging of the results of the queries; and

generating a result of the merging the identification of data stored on the computing device associated with the unique user identifier and the record of the result of the merging of the results of the queries.

19. Kirsch teaches of a system for identifying content of storage locations associated with a unique user security identifier comprising of a set of criteria including a unique security ID associated with the user; verifying the authorization of the user to access the data corresponding to the set of criteria based on the unique security ID; and obtaining content associated with the unique user security identifier and matching the unique user identifier (claim 1; col. 2, lines 2-14; col. 4, lines 3-19, 50-63).

20. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the set of criteria to include a unique user security ID associated with the user and verify the authorization of the user to access the data corresponding to the set of criteria based on the unique security ID to obtain content associated with the unique user security ID. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Kirsch's teachings would improve Goel's teachings by providing security of content on the network in order to prevent unauthorized accessed to private information.

21. Goel and Kirsch still do not specifically teach of:

determining that the at least one computing device is not available to receive a content query;

recalling the record of the merging of the results of the queries;

merging the identification of data stored on the computing device associated with the unique user identifier and the record of the result of the merging of the results of the queries; and

generating a result of the merging the identification of data stored on the computing device associated with the unique user identifier and the record of the result of the merging of the results of the queries.

22. Walters teaches of a search system, wherein the results of prior searches with same terms or keywords are combined with subsequent search records (col. 4, lines 24-31; col. 11, lines 18-26).

23. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the suggested system with the teachings of Walters to merge a subsequent search record with a search record from a previous search with the same terms or keywords. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Walter's teachings would enhance the suggested system by allowing a user to identify and review results of prior and current searches, and provide a sorted list to allow identification of previously reviewed responses.

24. Goel, Kirsch, and Walters still do not specifically teach of determining that the at least one computing device is not available to receive a content query.

25. Land teaches of a system for querying a search engine for a database, wherein a client device determines that a remote server is unavailable to receive a query and performs a local search (claim 21).

26. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the suggested system with the teachings of Land to determine if at least one of the two computing devices is not available to receive a query and perform a local search. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Land's teachings would improve the suggested system by allowing offline searching of content to respond to a query and prevent the unnecessary querying and waiting of an unavailable device.

27. As per claim 27, Goel teaches substantially the invention as claimed including a computer network having a computing device directly associated with a user and at least one remote computing device in communication, a method for managing data available for access on the network:

obtaining, by the computing device directly associated with the user, a first request to identify data corresponding to a set of criteria (col. 5, line 61-64; col. 6, line 5-19. Query at local system. Search terms.);

obtaining, by the computing device directly associated with the user, an identification of locally stored content matching the set of criteria (col. 6, lines 6-9, 46-49. Receive first result. col. 7, lines 47-56. Result may include identifier.);

transmitting, by the computing device directly associated with the user, the first request to the remote computing device for an identification of content matching the set of criteria (col. 6, lines 9-14, 50-64. Automatically query remote system.);

obtaining, by the remote computing device, an identification of locally stored content matching the set of criteria (col. 6, lines 9-14, 50-64. Derive a second result.);

transmitting, by the remote computing device, the identification of locally stored content matching the set of criteria (col. 5, line 61-64; col. 6, line 5-19. Query at local system. Search terms. It is inherent that a user may make more than one query with the same terms.);

merging, by the computing device directly associated with the user, content matching the set of criteria (col. 7, lines 47-56. Combine the first and second result.); and

generating, by the computing device directly associated with the user, a result of the merged content matching the set of criteria (Paragraph 0025. Displays results to user.);

maintaining a record of the result of the merging of content matching the set of criteria (col. 8, line 5-15. Display the result. It is inherent that the result is stored in memory while being displayed.);

obtaining, by the computing device directly associated with the user, a second request to identify data corresponding to the set of criteria (col. 5, line 61-64; col. 6, line 5-19. Query at local system.

Search terms. It is inherent that a user may make more than one query.);

obtaining, by the computing device directly associated with the user, an identification of locally stored content matching the set of criteria (col. 6, lines 6-9, 46-49. Receive first result. col. 7, lines 47-56. Result may include identifier.);

28. Goel does not specifically teach:

the set of criteria including a unique security ID associated with the user;

verifying the authorization of the user to access the data corresponding to the set of criteria based on the unique security ID;

determining, by the computing device directly associated with the user, that the remote computing device is not available to receive a content query;

recalling, by the computing device directly associated with the user, the record of the result of the merging of content matching the set of criteria;

merging, by the computing device directly associated with the user, the identification of locally stored content matching the set of criteria and the record of the result of the merging of content matching the set of criteria; and

generating a result of the merging of the identification of locally stored content matching the set of criteria and the record of the merging of content matching the set of criteria.

29. Kirsch teaches of a method for searching content comprising of a set of criteria including a unique security ID associated with the user; and verifying the authorization of the user to access the data corresponding to the set of criteria based on the unique security ID (claim 1; col. 2, lines 2-14; col. 4, lines 3-19).

Art Unit: 2154

30. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings for the set of criteria to include a unique security ID associated with the user; and verify the authorization of the user to access the data corresponding to the set of criteria based on the unique security ID. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Kirsch's teachings would improve Goel's teachings by providing security of content on the network to prevent unauthorized accessed to private information.

31. Land teaches of a system for querying a search engine for a database, wherein a client device determines that an other computing device (remote server) is unavailable to receive a query and performs at the host computer (claim 21).

32. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings to determine if the other computing device is not available to receive a query and perform a local search. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Land's teachings would improve the suggested system by allowing offline searching of content to respond to a query and prevent the unnecessary querying and waiting of an unavailable device.

33. Goel, Kirsch, and Land still do not specifically teach of:

recalling, by the computing device directly associated with the user, the record of the result of the merging of content matching the set of criteria;

merging, by the computing device directly associated with the user, the identification of locally stored content matching the set of criteria and the record of the result of the merging of content matching the set of criteria; and

generating a result of the merging of the identification of locally stored content matching the set of criteria and the record of the merging of content matching the set of criteria.

34. Walters teaches of a search system, wherein the results of prior searches with same terms or keywords are combined with search records (col. 4, lines 24-31; col. 11, lines 18-26).

35. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the suggested system with the teachings of Walters to merge a subsequent search record with a search record from a previous search with the same terms or keywords. The motivation for the suggested combination is that Walter's teachings would enhance the suggested system by allowing a user to identify and review results of prior and current searches, and provide a sorted list to allow identification of previously reviewed responses.

36. Claims 12, 24, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goel, Kirsch, Land, and Walter, in view of Smith, US Publication #2002/0059163 (Smith hereinafter).

37. As per claim 12, Goel, Kirsch, Land, and Walter teach of generating the result of the merging a identification of data stored on the host computing device associated with the second user request and the record of the result of the merging the identification of data stored on the host computing device associated with the first user request and the identification of data stored at least one computing device included in the computer network. Goel does not specifically teach the result of the merging including generating visual cues to the data not currently available to the user.

38. Smith teaches of searching information based upon search criteria, wherein search results are displayed and results that are not available may be flagged as unavailable (Paragraph 0049).

39. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the suggested system with Smith's teachings to display search results and flag the results that are not available. The motivation for the suggested modification is that Smith's teachings would enhance the user-friendliness of the suggested system by notifying to the user of content that cannot be accessed.

40. As per claim 24, Goel teaches of displaying the result of merge query result but does not specifically teach the method including generating visual cues corresponding to the data not currently available to the user.

41. Smith teaches of searching information based upon search criteria, wherein search results are displayed and results that are not available may be flagged as unavailable (Paragraph 0049).

42. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the suggested system with Smith's teachings to display search results and flag the results that are not available. The motivation for the suggested modification is that Smith's teachings would enhance the user-friendliness of the system by notifying to the user of content that cannot be accessed.

43. As per claim 37, Goel, Kirsch, Walter, and Land teach of generating the result of the merging of the identification of locally stored content matching the set of criteria and the record of the result of the merging of content matching the set of criteria. Goel does not specifically the result of the merging including generating visual cues corresponding to the data not currently available to the user.

44. Smith teaches of search information based upon search criteria, wherein search results are displayed and results that are not available may be flagged as unavailable (Paragraph 0049).

45. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the suggested system with Smith's teachings to display search results and flag the results that are not available. The motivation for the suggested modification is that Smith's teachings would enhance the user-friendliness of the system by notifying to the user of content that cannot be accessed.

### **Conclusion**

46. A shortened statutory period for reply to this Office action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action.

47. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joshua Joo whose telephone number is 571 272-3966. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday 8AM to 5PM and every other Friday.

48. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan J. Flynn can be reached on 571 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

49. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/J. J./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2154

/Nathan J. Flynn/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2154